



THE NEW YORK

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION



NEW YORK

1880

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

NEW YORK

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

Introduction.

THE Author of a late little Book, which bears the Title of [*Seek and you shall find,*] does, both in his own Name, and in the Name of many *Sincere* Persons, make open complaint of the *Licentiousness* of the *Press* (a). If he means by those Persons, such as are so *Sincere* in their Credulity, that they mixt not one grain of reasonable *Inquiry* with it, the Complaint will give no pain to judicious People, unless it be by moving them to pity his Weakness. And a Man would imagine, that his sort of *Sincere* People were so purely Credulous, seeing the Justice of the complaint is on the side of the *Reformed*. This lesser matter puts me in mind of a greater, yet of a like Nature, in the *Circumcellions*, one of those Branches into which the Faction, which sprang from *Donatus*, was divided. They went about doing injury to the Christians, from whom they had made a causeless Separation; and when their Incivilities were, by those whom they had provoked, turn'd upon them, they took the confidence to call themselves Martyrs.

But certainly, those, who are the illegal Aggressors, deserve the Blame. Those who send the Challenge are the *Licentious*, rather than the

(a) In the Epistle to the Reader, p. 9.

modest Accepters. And, when *Truth* and *Innocency* are assaulted, such as Honour them and have interest in them, ought to do some just thing in their necessary defence; and, if need be, draw their Pens in their Service. Provided that it be done (as, I think, by our Churchmen, it has been generally done) in a way consistent with decency of Manners, and publick Peace.

If, therefore, there appear amongst the Romanists, *Misrepresenters* and crafty Softners and Colourers of their own Doctrine; True and Faithful *Representers* are not unreasonably Officious, when they enter upon the Stage and take off the Disguise.

If *Artificial Explications* are imposed, and set to Sale in our own Language upon every Stall; it is very proper for such as are Friends to Sincerity, to take upon them the Office of *True Expounders*, and to convince the World, that such *Sweeteners* of the Doctrines of the *Synod of Trent*, have not declared what those Doctrines are, but what, in their Opinion, they ought to be; or, by what turns of Wit, they may be fenced against the Arguments of *Reformed Catholiques*.

If any Man thinks fit not only to Preach, but to Publish in this Nation, a Sermon of *St. Peter*, and, in that Sermon, "to reproach all Churches besides the Roman, as New Trimmed Vessels, leaky at the Bottom, and unable to carry those, who Sail in them, to the Haven; it cannot be a Crime to set forth a Discourse on the same Subject, (without any reflexion either on such a Person, or his Performance;) and to shew the true Sense of *Chouart Peter*, and the Safety of our Communion, and the Soundness of our Bottom; whilst some

See Dr. Godden's Ser. on St. Pet. day, p. 39.

are in a Vessel which has suffer'd so many Alterations and Additions, that it cannot be call'd the same Ship it was, when St. *Peter* was in it.

Again, if such **Guides in Controversy** offer themselves, as lead Men out of the way, and turn them round in an endless Circle; the Direction of honest Guides is a debt which they owe to Truth and Charity.

If Men in Books, in Pulpits, in Conversation, shall daily ask the question, Where is the Protestant's Judge? they ought to esteem it a Civility in others, when they give them a full Answer about a **Judge in Controversy**.

And if Men of like Perswasion revile the Church as the Schismatical party of *Donatus*, it is but of decency and not want of ability, that Men do not give them an **Treue** for their **Lurilla**. In the meantime, they have a Substantial Answer, though not so sharp a Rebuke, as their bold uncharitableness justly merited.

Last of all, If a *Romanist* accuseth the Church of England, as a Patroness of the Herefie of *Socinus*, though not with a direct and downright charge, yet from the consequence of her Methods; common Duty to so Good and Venerable a Mother constraineth her Sons to appear in her Vindication; and to shew that her Plea is very widely mistaken. If she pleads for *Arians*, *Socinians*, or any other Faction of Men, who have departed from the true Faith; she does it no otherwise than in the Words of her *Litany*. In that Pious Office, she beseebeth God to bring into the way of Truth all such as have erred and are deceived: And may God abundantly favour her Charitable Petition.

By

By such Considerations as these, I have, at last, been moved to write an Answer to the Book which the Author is pleas'd to call *The Protestants Plea for a Socinian*, and to make that Answer publick. But I must acknowledge, that, upon other Accounts, the Diversion which this Answer has given me, has been very unwelcom: As unwelcom as the trouble was to those of old time, who, when they were employ'd in offering Sacrifice, were forc'd to turn aside, and drive away from the Altar the greedy Fowls, and the impertinent Flies.

Now, in this *Answer*, I shall, for Order-sake, and that I may proceed distinctly, reduce what I purpose to say to certain Heads; and they are these three which follow.

I. *Observations touching the Book itself, its Edition, Character and design.*

II. *Considerations relating to the General Argument of it, by which it may appear to be of no real force against the Plea of the Reformed.*

III. *Particular Answers to the Particular Parts of this pretended Protestants Plea, as it stands divided in the Five Conferences of the Author.*

The

*The Difference betwixt the Protestant
and Socinian Methods, &c.*

CHAP. I.

*Observations touching the Book itself,
its Edition, Character and Design.*

FOR *the Book itself*, it may be noted in
the

First place, That it is neither *new*, nor
entire. It is the *Fourth Discourse* in the
Second Edition of the *Guide in Controversies*, set out
in the Year 1673. If this Tract was published be-
fore that time, to me it was not; for then, and
not before, it came to my knowledge. But this
is not the thing which gives our Ecclesiasticks of-
fence; for whether the Men of Controversie bring
into the Field either their Old or their New Arti-
lery of Arguments, this Apostolical Church is proof
against them.

The Book, of which this *Plea* is a part, is be-
lieved, by many of the same way, to be of very
great Strength and Solidity: And when a Questio-
n is moved concerning their Faith, they think it
enough to say, *The Guide is unanswered**. If that
be a good Method, a Protestant, upon the like Ep. D. I.
occasion,

* See Resp. ad.

occasion, may take leave to say, The *Book against the Popes Supremacy*, written by the learned and humble Dr. Barrow, is *unanswerable*. And, after all this, the *Guide* is actually answered, though not in the Formality of *Word for Word*, in a great Volume of Refutation *. The Bottom on which all is built is shew'd to be false; and if a Workman discovers the unsoundness of the Foundation, he is not oblig'd to tell particularly how every single Brick is dawbed with untempered Mortar. The *Guide* is sufficiently answered, if it be prov'd, either that the first step he sets is false, or that he wants Eyes, or that he is, by prejudice, blinded. Some such thing seems to be, in some degree, in this *Guide in Controversie*; and I may set it down as my

Second Observation, That though there is a commendable Temper in *this*, and his other Writings, yet there is an obscureness in all of them; and he that is conversant in his Books, is as if he walk'd in a calm, but darkish Night.

Part of this obscureness to the Unlearned riseth from *Hard Words*, which, though they seem not to be affected by the Author, are yet very frequently used by him. Such are, in his other Discourses, (a) *Relative Cult.* (b) *Salvific* (c) *Non-clearness* (d) *Inerrability* (e) *Church-Anarchical* (f) *Traditive-Sense* (g) *Deceffion* (g).

And, in *this Plea*, *Autocatacrifise* (h), *Plerophory* (i), *Cognoscitive Faculties* (k), *Unliteral* (l), *Consubstantiality* (m).

But the plain truth is this, That where the Cause will not bear manifest and sound Sense, it must be darkned with Words, if Men will plead, with Art, for

* See D. Still.
sev. Discourses
in Answer to
the *Guide in*
Contr. &c. p.
326, 327, &c.

(a) Disc. 3.
p. 264.
(b) P. 322.
(c) Disc. of
Nec. of Ch.
Guides, p. 8.
(d) Disc. 3 p. 169
(e) Disc. 1. p. 9
(f) Disc. 2. p. 138
(g) Disc. 1. p. 47.
(h) Prot. Plea,
p. 24, 28, 29, 30
(i) P. 13.
(j) P. 10.
(k) P. 11.
(m) P. 4, 14, 16,
26, 32, 37.

for it. Concerning the Sense of the Protestants darkened in this and his other Discourses, he has done it with *Art* enough; I cannot say, with equal *Sincerity*. Little Pieces of their Writings are taken out of their Places, and inlaid in such manner as to serve the Figure of *his* Work, but to blemish *theirs*. And it may be a

Third Note, with particular reference to Mr. *Chillingworth*, whom, in this short Dialogue, he has cited more than *twenty times*, that whilst he has picked out of him many other Words, he has omitted every one of those which do expressly answer this *Plea for a Socinian*. I will set down these Words afterwards, in their due place, for the Satisfaction of Ingenuous Readers; (*) and to shew that great Accomplishments may be attended with great Insincerity.

(*) See M. Chill. Pref. to the Author of Char. maintain'd, Sect. 16, 17, 18. and, in this Answer, p. 13, 22, 54, 58.

Fourthly, I observe concerning *this Writer*, That he has not, in this *Dialogue* betwixt a *Protestant* and a *Socinian*, strictly kept the Character of either of them.

First, He hath not accurately observed the Character of a *Socinian*.

He introduceth the *Socinian* as insisting perpetually upon the Point of the *Consubstantiality* of the Son of God, or his being of one and the same Essence or Substance with the Father: Whereas that properly the Point in Controversie betwixt the *Arians* and the Catholick Christians, rather than betwixt them and the *Socinians*, who derive themselves from *Artemon* and *Samosatenus* more directly than from *Arius*. It is true, they deny that Christ is of the same Substance with his Father, but their proper *Heretic* is the denial of his being any thing

before he was conceiv'd by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin *Mary*: For this reason the Extracts out of the Readings of the *College of Posnan* (*n*) against the *Socinians*, have the Name given to them of *Theological Assertions* against the *New Samosatensians*, and not the *New Arians*; yet in some respects they are, and may be so called, without absurdness of Speech. *Socinus* himself will not admit that the true *Arians* are of his way, further than as they agree with him in affirming the Father to be the only God by Essence (*o*). And *Sandius*, though he was a professed *Arian*, and an avowed Enemy of the *Nicene Doctrine*, yet he wrote against the *Socinian Heresies*, which affirm, That *Christ* was a meer Man, and deny that the Spirit of God is a Person (*p*). But the Author may have been moved to select this Point because of its accidental difficulty occasion'd by Scholastick Niceness in their Disputes about this Mystery, and the Controversies which they have carry'd on about the very term of *Homousiety*. There was artifice, therefore, in singling out this Point as capable of being turned into perplexity. Especially (as *Glossæus* (*q*) the *Socinian* notes) when the *Occams* and the *Durands* enter into Questions about *Formalities*, *Quiddities*, and *Personalities*. Other Points (as about *Baptism*, the *Lords Supper*, *Orders*, and the *Church*) would have been too plain for the purpose.

Again, This Author brings, or rather forces in his *Socinian*, and makes him to speak to the *Protestant* in these words: (*r*) ——— “I pray tell me, “Whether do you certainly know the Sense of the “Scriptures, for the Evidence of which you separated

(*n*) See Bibl. Fratr. Pol. in Vol. 2. Op. Soc. p. 422.

(*o*) Socin. Contra Vujekum, Vol. 2. p. 618.

(*p*) Script. S. Trinit. Revelatrix, p. 173. &c. & Problem. Paradox. de Sp. S. p. 3. &c.

(*q*) Gloss. in Præf. ad Disp. de Personâ.

(*r*) Prot. Plea, p. 5.

“rated from the Church before Luther, requiring
 “Conformity to the contrary Doctrines as a Con-
 “dition of her Communion? This is rather the
 Phrase of a Papist than a Socinian. For, though
Socinus believ’d his own Scheme to be new, and
 distinct from the whole Church, he did not believe
 that the *Lutherans* had made such a Separation.
 Neither would he have disputed with them about
 the Sense of the Scriptures, for the Evidence of which
 they separated (or rather were driven) from the
 Church of *Rome*; for he did allow that those places
 were clear. Nor would he have given to the Ro-
 man Church the name of the *whole Church*, or scarce
 of a *Church at all*. He did not so much as allow it
 to be a *true Church* in the most favourable sense of
 the Protestants, who distinguish betwixt a true
 and a pure Church, and compare it to a Mass of
 Silver embased with Lead.

Socinus plac’d the Truth of the Church in the
 Truth of its Doctrine (*s*), from which Truth he
 held the Church of *Rome* to be extremely departed.
 He affirm’d concerning the *Notes* or *Signs* of the
 Church, That either they were false; or, if true,
 belong’d not to the Church of *Rome*: And he made
 particular Instance in the *Mark of Pals*. He de-
 clar’d concerning *Luther*, (*t*) “That he drew Men
 “off from false Worship and Idolatry, and brought
 “them to that Knowledge of Divine Matters which
 “was sufficient for the procuring of Eternal Life.
 He added, “That God did afterwards, by *Zuing-*
 “*lius* and *Oecolampadius*, reform certain things of
 “very great importance. He repeats it again, That,
 “by the means of *Luther*, Men were enlightned in
 “those things which were absolutely necessary to

(*s*) Socin. de
 Ecclesiâ, Op.
 Vol. 1. p. 341,
 342.

(*t*) Socin. So-
 lut. Scrupul.
 Resp. ad 23.
 Vol. 1. Op.
 p. 332.

" Salvation. So that this Author does not exactly personate a *Socinian* when he speaks thus in a *Socinian's* Name ; " Whether do you certainly know " the Sense of the Scriptures for the Evidence of " which you separated from the Church before Lu-
" ther ?

(u) Prot. Plea,
p. 43.

Again, A *Socinian* would not have spoken as this Author does in his Name, calling a heinous Iniquity a (u) very great Moral Sin. Nor would any accurate Speaker have us'd that improper Expression.

* Prot. Plea,
p. 37. Soc.
Though I
stand separa-
ted from the
present unre-
formed Churches,
or also
(if you will)
from the
whole Church
that was be-
fore Luther.

Prot. Plea,
Conf. 5. p. 33.

Then (Secondly) for the *Protestant* in the *Dialogue*, he does here and there misrepresent his Sense, and speak, at the same time, as by him, and yet against him. For Example-sake ; the *Socinian* having said out of Mr. *Chillingworth*, That his Party had not forsaken the whole Church, seeing themselves were a part of it, (which, by the way, a *Socinian* would scarce have said, but rather have own'd his Church to have been a new one upon the whole Matter, and granted a kind of Universal Apostasy *) the *Protestant* is brought in as in a manner deriding this Argument in his own Person, or at least as contented with it as, by a *Socinian*, propos'd : ——— " So then it seems we need fear no " Schism from the Church Catholick till a part can " divide from itself, which can never be. Where-
as a *Protestant* would have first told them, that there is just fear of a Schism in the Body of the Church Catholick, though not from it : And that they had made a Separation from the sound parts of it, though not from the whole ; whilst the *Protestants* were both Members of the Universal Church, and in Communion with all particular Churches so far as they
they

they are Christian. He would have added, That Mr. *Chillingworth's* Words were proper in his own Case, but not in the Case of a *Socinian* Church, which is taken to be a Member in the Universal Church, but unsound and out of its place.

Fourthly, It may be noted, that the Author of this Book is not the *Inventer*, but the *Borrower* of this Argument call'd *The Protestants Plea for a Socinian*. It has been used by *Valerianus Magnus*; by the Author of the *Brief Disquisition*; by Sir *Kenelm Digby*, in his *Discourse* (x) *concerning the Infallibility of Religion*, (if he be the genuine Author;) by the *Jesuite* who cavill'd against Dr. *Potter's* Book call'd, *Want of Charity*. Which Argument of the *Jesuite* was long ago answer'd by Mr. *Chillingworth* (y), though this Author, who was under Obligation, by the very Nature of his Undertaking, to have Reply'd, is pleas'd to pass it over in silence.

Since that time, *Louis Maimbourg* (then a *Jesuite*) wrote a Book Intituled, *A Treatise concerning the True Word of God* (z). Four Chapters of that little Book are spent in the managing of this Method. And, If you will take it upon his own Word, he has come into the Field with *Invincible Weapons* (a). About two years after, this *Protestants Plea* is set to sale among us, after the English manner in other knacks. After the *French*, comes the *English Guide*; after the *Foreign Expositor*, the *English Misrepresenter*. We follow when the Mode declines elsewhere. When others molt their Feathers, we take them up and write with them. Yet this is to be acknowledg'd, that our Author, both in his Judgment and Manners, and closeness of Writing, does much exceed that *Monsieur Maimbourg*, though he may seem to have taken some Hints from him.

My

(x) Chap. 16.
P. 199.

(y) See *Chill.*
Pref. to the
Author of
Char. Maint.
Sect. 16. 17. 18
And here p. 9,
22, 54, 58.

(z) *Traité de la*
Vraie Parole
de Dieu, à Pa-
ris, 1671. c. 7.
p. 47. c. 8. p. 62.
c. 9. p. 71. c. 10.
p. 87. See part ic.
p. 82. 87. 88.

(a) P. 380. Par
des *Raisons in-*
vincibles.

My *Last Observation* toucheth the design of this Book, which looks as if it were particularly levell'd against the *Established Church of England*. It is true, the more general Name of *Protestant* is used, but the Authors who are cited are not *Luther* or *Calvin*; *Calixtus* or *Daille*; *Cartwright* or *Travers*; but *Archb. Laud*; *Archb. Bramhal*; *Mr. Chillingworth*; *Dr. Hammond*; *Dr. Fern*, and *Dr. Stillingfleet*. Now it has been one of the later Stratagems of evil Men, to Misrepresent the Ministers of this Sound Church, as favourers of the Doctrines of *Socinus*, and at this very time this Art is in Practice. Otherwise, why does the Paper just now scattered abroad, (b) style the *Socinians* the *Brethren* of Protestants by descent and iniquity? To what other purpose serveth the beginning of the long Book just now appearing, and call'd, a *Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln* (c)? For the Author complains of the *Arian History* of *Sandius*, as publish'd here at *London*, (though 'twas set forth in *Holland*, and in *England* twice refuted) and of that Bishops declining an Answer to it; which (surely) he might reasonably do, without any approbation of so ill a Book; for every Man is not at leisure to do every thing in Learning, which, in the general, is fit to be done.

The Title of this Book is Serviceable to the above-said design, by way of Insinuation. And who will assure us, that it was not pick'd out of the *Guide* for this disingenuous end? That it was gathered meerly as the choicest Flower contain'd in that Book; and not as the fittest in this juncture for this calumniating purpose? I do not believe that this was the principal design either of the Author or the Publisher. But, if a Man, that goes about to fence him-
self

(b) Request to
Prot. p. 3.

(c) See P. IV.
fourth Letter,
p. 129, 130,
131.

self from his Neighbour, can both dig his Ditch, and cast his durt upon him, he may, perhaps, be so ill natur'd as to think he does well to dispatch two works at a time.

However it be with our present Author, this is certain, *Socinus* himself taking notice of it (d), that *England* and *Scotland* were not favourable to his Doctrine; and that it sprang out of *Italy*. *Sozzo* the Uncle, *Blandrata*, *Paruta*, *Alciat*, were *Italians*, and bred in the Roman Church. *Ochinus* was of *Siena*, and, some say (e), Confessor to the Pope, and General of the Order of the *Capucins*. *Faustus Socinus* the Nephew, as well as *Laelius* the Uncle, was of the same *Siena*, and nearly related to *Pius*, the Second, and Third; and to *Paul* the Fifth (f). And, of the First Chapter of the Second Book of the Reformation of the Church of *Poland* (g), these are the Contents. "After what manner the Seeds of Divine Truth were carried out of *Italy* into *Poland*, in the Year 1551 by *Laelius Socinus*. And before his remove in the Year 1546, he had form'd a *Socinian Cabal* of *Italians* in the Territories of *Venice* (h), and especially at *Vicenza*, amounting to a considerable number. And I find it said elsewhere (i), that, in the Year 1539. the burning of a Lady who had turn'd from the Church of *Rome*, open'd the Eyes of Men in *Poland*, and dispos'd them to inquiry into Truth.

I have seen some Applications (k) of the *Socinians* to the *Mohometans*, in which they shew what approaches they make towards them. I have read of Conditions of Accommodation betwixt the *Socinians* and the *Romanists* (l). But Fame it self (I think) has not invented any such project betwixt the *Socinians* and the *English Church*.

(d) Socin. Solut. Scrup. Vol. 1. p. 332.

(e) Biblioth. Anti-Trin. p. 2. & Bzovius. A. 1542.

(f) Ibid. p. 64.

(g) Hist. Reformation. Polon. p. 38.

(h) Bibl. Anti-Trin. p. 18. & H. Ref. Pol. p. 38.

(i) Excerpta MS. & Lib. Annal. Polon. p. 1.

(k) MS. Ep. off. English Unitarian. to Ameth Ben Ameth Amb. of Fez and Morocco.

(l) Bibl. Anti-Trin. p. 149. Conditiones Unionis Christianorum cum Catholicis Rom. in Polonia.

I do not offer this discourse, as a proof of encouragement for *Socinianism* in the Church of *Rome*, yet it is an Argument sufficient for the Silencing of those of that Communion, who charge it upon *Ours*.

(m) Maimb.
Hist. de l' Ari-
anisme. Liv.
Douz. p. 360.

And for other Churches, that which is said already may be a proof of the wonted Sincerity of *Monsieur Maimbourg*, who tells his Readers with assurance, that the Persons who, after the interval of nigh 900 Years, reviv'd *Arianism*, were all of them either *Lutherans* or *Calvinists* before they became the Disciples of *Socinus* (m). A Man ought to have been Master of their History, before he had pronounc'd so freely of them: But some have an extraordinary Talent in making History.

(n) MS. in
Præf. p. 1.

It is true, the Author of *Constantiæ Religionis Christianæ* (n), was by Education a *Lutheran*; but he was taken young into the School of the *Jesuites*: And, after having been Ten Years among them, he turn'd *Socinian*; as he himself relates his own Story. And Men, who consider the Nature of causes and effects, are inclined to believe that the way to *Socinianism* has been much open'd and widen'd by the *Popish Doctors* who have so vehemently urg'd the *Obscureness* of the Scriptures in the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*; and who, at this very time, furnish the *Hawkers* with their little *Dialogues*, endeavouring to equal the new *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*, with that of *Three Persons* in one incomprehensible Essence. For to say, that that invention of *Paschasius* is as reasonable to be believ'd as the great *Mystery* of the *Trinity*, by all good *Catholicks*, is in effect to say, that neither of them is reasonable.

Dialogue be-
tween a new
Cath. Convert
and a *Piot*,

CHAP. II.

Considerations touching the General Argument of the Protestants Plea for a Socinian ; shewing the weakness of it , and that it is not of force enough to overthrow the Plea of the Reformed.

LET that which hath been said, suffice for the *Quality* of this Writing, I will proceed to the *General Argument* of it, which may, in-brief, be thus represented.

The *Protestants* and *Socinians*, agree in their *Plea*, they alledge Scripture, they measure Faith by it as by a compleat and clear Rule. They reject *Councils*, and the *Major part of Church Authority*, if they are not convinc'd that they are founded on the Scriptures, in finding out the sense of which both sides profess due *Industry*. Both parties excuse themselves, (whatsoever Doctrines they advance, whatsoever Wounds they open in the Church) as uninfected with *Heresy*, and free from *Schism*, till their private Spirit be satisfi'd, and, before the Tribunal they erect in their own Heads, they are self-accus'd and self-condemned.

Therefore Protestants make Apology for *Socinians*, and are neither able to confute them, upon
C
these

these Principles and Methods; nor to justify themselves; but are oblig'd to appeal to the *Infallible Judge*, or the *Major part* of the *Bench of Judges* in the *Roman Church*, where all such Controversies may be effectually ended.

The force of this specious Argument will be abated (as all such Arguments may easily be, whose force lays only in plausible appearance) by a few plain Considerations.

First, the *Socinians* will not allow their *Plea* to be perfectly the same with that of the Protestants; especially those of the *Established Church of England*. The *Socinian* Author of the *Brief Disquisition* proceeds upon a supposed difference; and he endeavours to shew that unless the *Evangelical* quitted their own way of *Resolving Faith*, and made use of the Methods of *Socinus*, they could not Solidly and Evidently refute the Romanists, and particularly the Judgment of *Valerianus Magnus*, concerning the Protestant Rule of *Believing*.

Secondly, Both *Arians* and *Socinians* plead *Tradition*; though their *Plea* is not manag'd exactly after our better manner. And when they plead *Tradition*, why is not theirs then as much the *Popish Plea*, as, when they plead *Scripture*, it is the Protestants? for neither do they plead that just as this Church does.

Two Assertions may be here advanc'd.

First, that the *Arians* and *Socinians* plead *Tradition*.

Secondly, that some *Papists* have help'd the more Modern of them to Materials for the making of that *Plea*.

First, *Arians* and *Socinians* plead *Tradition* against the Divine Nature of Christ, as the Romanists plead

plead Tradition for it. *Artemon* taught the Heresie of our Saviours being a meer Man. And we are assured by an unnamed (a), but an antient and (as appeareth by his Fragments) a very sagacious Author, that his Party declared that they follow'd *Antiquity*; that their Ancestors and the Apostles themselves were of the same belief; that, to the time of *Pope Victor*, the true Doctrine of the Apostles was preserved; and that it was corrupted in the times of his Successor *Zephyrin*. These (how unjust soever) were their Allegations.

(a) Acon. ap.
Euf. Eccl. H.
E. l. 5. C. ult.
p. 195.

Socinus (b) takes the boldness to affirm, That the Romanists are not able to defend their Principles about the *Trinity*, by the Authority of the *Fathers*: And, on the contrary, that the *Earlier Fathers* (c), who liv'd before the *Council of Nice*, were firm in his belief. He cites the *Council of Ariminum*, *Justin the Martyr*, and *S. Hilary*. He promiseth (upon supposition of leisure) to write a *Traet* on this Subject, for the satisfaction of those who are moved with such Authority.

(b) Soc. de Ec-
cles. Op. Vol. 1.
p. 323.

(c) Socin. Resp.
ad Voiekm,
p. 118.

Crellius (d) pretends that, during 300 years after Christ, the Doctors of the Church consented in this Faith, That the *Father was the most High God*, whilst the *Son was a Deity different from the Creator of the World*. He says of *Grotius*, in upbraiding manner, That he must needs know of this Historical Truth, being a Man conversant in the *Fathers*. He quotes *Justin Martyr* in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, as Evidence on his side. He has the Confidence to say, That the Men of his Way have demonstrated this; and that the very Adversaries of the *Unitarians* have confessed this to be true in *Tertullian* and *Origen*. He introduceth *S. Hilary* as a

(d) Crell. Praef.
ad Lect. Lib.
de Satisfact.
p. 4, 5.

Patron of that Doctrine which denies the *Divinity of the Spirit of God*. He presumes to say, That the nearer approaches we make to the *Anti-Trinitarians*, the nigher we come to the Apostolical Faith.

* Hieron.
Moscorov. in
Ref. Append.
Mart. Smigle-
cii, p. 19.

Moscorovius * charges his Adversaries with misrepresenting of the first Fathers, when they bring them in as Witnesses of that Faith concerning the Trinity which they profess. And he proceeds in telling of them, "That *Ignatius*, the most antient "of those Church-Doctors whose Writings are extant, does openly say the contrary in his *Epistle* "to those of *Tarsus*, affirming that Christ is not "the Deity who is God over all, but only the Son "of God. He goes on in citing *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*; how much to the purpose, it is not my business here to determine. It is true, *Ignatius* is not the most antient of those Doctors whose Writings are extant: but when he wrote this (e), Mr. Young had not published *Clements Epistle*, nor *Menardus* that of *Barnabas*. It is also confess'd that he cites a spurious Piece of *Tradition*, (for *Ignatius* wrote not that *Epistle Ad Tarsenses*); but, in the mean time, to Tradition, he, in part, appeals.

(e) Racov.
1611.

(f) Lubien.
Hist. Ref. Polon.
lon. l. i. c. 2.
p. 5, 6, 7, 8.

Lubieniecus (f) spends a Chapter in *Demonstrating* (as he imagin'd) that God had not left his Church, from the Apostles times to his, without Witnesses of the Doctrine which denies the Trinity. He glories in *Artemon*, *Samosatenus*, *Photinus*, and others: for Men are apt, in all Factions, to pretend to Number and Antiquity.

Christopher Sandius wrote his indigested Heap of Church-Story with this very design, that, in the several Centuries, he might take especial notice of the

the Favourers of the *Arian* Doctrine. And, under the borrowed Name of *Cingallus* (g), he gives himself the Honour of having made a *most solid* proof concerning all the Fathers of the three first Ages, that they believed as *Arius* believ'd.

(g) Cingal. Script. S. Trin. Revelatrix. p. 30.

Mr. *Biddle*, in the *Appendix* to his Book against the Holy *Trinity* (h), endeavours to strengthen his Plea with the Testimonies of *Irenaus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Novatian*, *Theophilus*, *Origen*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, and *Hilary* of *Poitiers*. He pretends to the *Fathers*, though he is guilty of false mustering.

(h) Biddle's Apostol. Opin. conc. the holy Trin. reviv'd and asserted, Lond. 1653.

Monsieur Aubert du Verfoy tells the World (i) with great assurance, "That all the *Fathers* who liv'd before the *Council* of *Nice* were ignorant of "that Notion of the *Trinity* which is now commonly embrac'd; that all of them deny'd the Eternal "Generation of the Son of God; that all believ'd "the Father to be the only Sovereign, Omnipotent, "Eternal God.

(i) Protestant Pacifique, part 2. p. 25.

The *Socinians*, who offer'd to make Application here to the late *Ambassador* of the King of *Fez* and *Morocco*, would, in their *Epistle* (k), perswade his Excellency, "That Antiquity was on their side from "Adam to Christ: and that all the Primitive Christians, in and after Christ and his Apostles times, "never own'd any other besides the single and supreme Deity of the Father. This could not be said of all the *Fathers* from a Judicious Reader of them, but might be borrow'd from the same Person who furnish'd *Sandins* with his false Witnesses (l). This brings to my memory, in due method, the

(k) Ep. of Socin. to Amb. &c. p. 3.

(l) V. Sand. 1. 1. Sec. 4. Nocl. p. 156. Octav.

Second Assertion, That some of the *Arians* and *Socinians* who put *Tradition* into their Plea, have fetch'd

(m) See Petav. l. 1. c. 5. Sect. 7. de Trin. &c. & ap. Smid. Nael H. E. 12. l. 1. p. 217, 218. l. 2. p. 30. & ap. Cingal. p. 35, 35 & p. 31. quomodo enim illud queat esse ex Trad. Apostol. quod demum quarto fec. patefact. & constitut. ait Dionysius Petavius. See Sand. in Ind. H. L. t. P. Petavius probat omnes Patres ante Conc. Nic. Eadem cum Alio ante discussisse
(n) De'ense des Sentimens, p. 80. A nes le P. Petavi Jesuite. (o) Cingall. p. 33, 36. (p) P. 16. p. 66, 67. ex Huet. Origen. (q) D. G. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. (r) Defense des Sentimens, &c. p. 78, &c. See here p. 9, 13, 34, 58. (s) In Chill. Pref. Sect. 9. p. 6. (t) Chill. Pref. to the Author of *Charity Maimain'd*, Sect. 16, 17, 18. p. 9, 10, 11.

fetch'd their Materials from a *Roman Storehouse*, though not directly from the Church herself. The Jesuite *Petavius* is the Man: And his *Second Tome of Ecclesiastical Doctrines*, is their Magazine (m). Infomuch that the Companions of *Monsieur Clerc* (n), having first taken notice of the Citations of *Curcellæus* in favour of the *Arian Doctrine*, do after that, refer us to Father *Petau*, as to the Author whom he follow'd. The Modern *Arians* have, also, call'd *Huetius* in to their assistance, in their *Plea* from *Tradition*, against the Divinity both of the *Son* (o) and of the *Spirit* of God (p). But the mistakes of *Petavius* and others in this matter have been publickly shew'd by a Learned Person (q) of this Church, whose Work, though the Friends of *Monsieur Clerc* have touch'd upon, they have not refuted (r).

Mr. *Chillingworth* urg'd some such thing as this in part of his Answer to the *Jesuite* who charg'd the *Protestant* as the *Advocate* of the *Socinian*, and he cited only the Notes of *Petavius* on *Epiphanius*; the *Ecclesiastical Doctrines* of that Father not being then come forth into the Light. I will set down *Mr. Chillingworth's* words, because they are omitted by this Author, who quotes him often where it is less to the purpose, and omits that in which he speaks directly to his point.

The *Jesuite* had thus Misrepresented the Faith of the Reformed, Chap. 2. S. & 2. (s) "The very Doctrine of Protestants, if it be follow'd closely and with coherence to itself, must of necessity induce *Socinianism*. To this Charge Mr. *Chillingworth* (t) makes the following Reply.

16. "Had

16. "Had I a mind to recriminate now, and to charge Papists (as you do Protestants) that they lead Men to *Socinianism*, I could certainly make a much fairer shew of evidence than you have done. For I would not tell you, You deny the Infallibility of the Church of *England*; *Ergo*, you lead to *Socinianism*, which yet is altogether as good an Argument as this, Protestants deny the Infallibility of the Roman Church; *Ergo*, they induce *Socinianism*, nor would I resume my former Argument, and urge you, that by holding the Popes Infallibility, you submit your self to that Capital and Mother Heresie, by advantage whereof, he may lead you at ease to believe Virtue Vice, and Vice Virtue; to believe Antichristianity Christianity, and Christianity Antichristian; he may lead you to *Socinianism*, to *Turcism*, — if he have a mind to it; But I would shew you that divers ways the *Doctors* of your Church do the principal and proper work of the *Socinians* for them, undermining the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*, by denying it to be supported by those Pillars of the Faith, which alone are fit and able to support it, I mean *Scripture*, and the *Consent* of the *antient Doctors*.

17. "For *Scripture*, your Men deny very plainly and frequently, that this *Doctrine* can be proved by it. See if you please, this plainly taught, and urged very earnestly by Cardinal *Hosius*, *De Author. Sac. Scrip.* l. 3. p. 53. By *Gordonius Huntlaus*, *Contr. Tom. 1. Controv. 1. De Verbo Dei C.* 19. By *Gretserus* and *Tannerus*, in *Colloquio Ratisbon.* And also by *Vega*, *Possevin*, *Wiekus*, and others.

18. "And

18. "And then for the *Consent* of the *Ancients*,
 "that that also delivers it not, by whom are we
 "taught but by Papists only? Who is it that makes
 "known to all the World, that *Eusebius* that great
 "searcher and devourer of the Christian Libraries
 "was an *Arian*? Is it not your great *Achilles*, Cardinal
 "*Perron*, in his Third Book 2 Chap. of his Reply
 "to King *James*? Who is it that informs us that *Ori-*
 "*gen* (who never was questioned for any error in
 "this matter in or near his time) denied the Divi-
 "nity of the Son and the Holy Ghost? Is it not the
 "same great Cardinal in his Book of the Eucharist
 "against *M. du Plessis* l. 2. c. 7? Who is it that pre-
 "tends that *Irenæus* hath said those things, which he
 "that should now hold would be esteemed an *Arian*?
 "Is it not the same *Perron*, in his reply to K. *James*,
 "in the Fifth Chapter of his Fourth Observation?
 "And doth he not in the same place peach *Tertul-*
 "*lian* also, and in a manner give him away to the
 "*Arians*? And pronounce generally of the Fathers
 "before the *Council of Nice*, that the *Arians* would
 "gladly be tried by them? And are not your Fel-
 "low-*Jesuites* also, even the prime Men of your
 "Order, Prevaricators in this point as well as others?
 "Doth not your Friend *M. Fisher*, or *M. Floyd*, in
 "his *Book of the Nine Questions* proposed to him by
 "*K. James*, speak dangerously to the same purpose,
 "in his discourse of the resolution of Faith, towards
 "the end? Giving us to understand, that the new
 "reformed *Arians* bring very many Testimonies of
 "the Ancient Fathers to prove that in this point
 "they did contradict themselves, and were contrary
 "one to another, which places whosoever shall
 "read, will clearly see, that to common People
 "they

"they are unanswerable; yea, that common People
 "are not capable of the Answers that Learned Men
 "yield unto such obscure passages. And hath not
 "your great Antiquary *Petavius*, in his Notes up-
 "on *Epiphanius* in *Har.* 69. been very liberal to the
 "Adversaries of the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, and
 "in a manner given them for Patrons and Advo-
 "cates? First *Justin Martyr*, and then almost all
 "the *Fathers* before the *Council of Nice*, whose
 "Speeches, he says, touching this Point, *Cum Or-*
 "*thodoxa Fidei regulâ minime consentiunt?* Here-
 "unto I might add, That the *Dominicans* and *Je-*
 "*suites* between them in another matter of great
 "importance, *viz.* Gods Prescience of future Con-
 "tingents, give the *Socinians* the Premises, out of
 "which their Conclusion doth unavoidably follow.
 "For the *Dominicans* maintain on the one side,
 "That God can foresee nothing but what he de-
 "crees; The *Jesuites* on the other side, That
 "he doth not decree all things; and from hence
 "the *Socinians* conclude, (as it is obvious for
 "them to do,) That he doth not foresee all things.
 "Lastly, I might adjoyn this, That you agree with
 "one consent, and settle for a Rule unquestionable,
 "That no part of Religion can be repugnant to
 "Reason, whereunto you in particular subscribe
 "unawares in saying, *From Truth no Man can by*
 "*good Consequence infer Falshood*; which is to say
 "in effect, That Reason can never lead any Man to
 "Error: And after you have done so, you pro-
 "claim to all the World, (as you in this Pamphlet
 "do very frequently,) That if Men follow their
 "Reason and Discourse, they will (if they under-
 "stand themselves) be led to *Socinianism*. And
 "thus you see with what probable Matter I might
 D "furnish

“furnish out and justify my Accusation, if I should
 “charge you with leading Men to *Socinianism*. Yet
 “I do not conceive that I have ground enough for
 “this odious Imputation. And much less should
 “you have charged Protestants with it, whom you
 “confess to abhor and detest it; and who fight
 “against it, not with the broken Reeds, and out
 “of the Paper-Fortresses of an imaginary Infallibi-
 “lity, which were only to make sport for their
 “Adversaries; but with the *Sword of the Spirit*,
 “the *Word of God*; of which we may say most
 “truly, what *David* said of *Goliath*’s Sword, offer-
 “ed by *Abimeleck*, *Non est sicut iste*, There is none
 “comparable to it.

Thirdly, Though the Modern *Arians* and *Soci-
 nians* do speak of Tradition, and not of Scripture
 only, yet our Plea and theirs is not perfectly the
 same. Touching the Holy Scripture, we have a
 greater Veneration for it than many of them; and
 for Tradition, though we make it not the very Rule
 of our Faith, nor place Infallibility in it; yet, in
 concurrence with Scripture, it weigheth not so
 much with them as with us.

We have a greater Veneration for the Holy Scri-
 pture itself, than the *right Socinian*: For such a
 one makes Reason the Rule of that Rule; and
 though he thinks a Doctrine is plain in Scripture,
 yet, if he believes it to be against his Reason, he
 assents not to it. Whereas a Man of this Church
 believes the Scriptures to be written by Inspiration
 from God: And, upon that account he assures
 himself that nothing contrary to true Reason can
 be contained in the Scriptures. Therefore when
 he finds any thing in Holy Writ which to him is
 incomprehensible, he does not say he believes it
 though

though it be impossible and irrational ; but he believes it to be rational though mysterious ; and he suspects not Reason itself, but his own present Art of Reasoning whensoever it concludes against that which he reads, and reads without doubting of the sense of the words: And by Meditation he at last finds his error.

The *Socinians* (u) challenge to themselves *Petrus Abailardus* as one of their Predecessors: For this they cite *St. Bernard* ; and they strengthen their challenge with the Testimony of *Baronius*, who says of *Abailardus*, That he made Reason the Judge of Articles of Faith. It is true, a Protestant judges whether his Faith be rational, or whether it be founded on Divine Revelation ; but he will not allow his Reasonings to oppose any Principle in Holy Writ: For that were either to deny it to be of God, or, with blasphemous irreverence, to reproach the Almighty Wisdom with a Contradiction. Yet after this manner *Socinians* argue, though some of them use great caution, and few make open profession of it: Nay, they sometimes tell us, That the Scripture contains nothing contrary to manifest Reason (x). However, by their manner of objecting against the Doctrine of the blessed Trinity, the Sagacious are convinc'd, that they first think it to be against plain Reason, and then, rejecting it as an error, they colour their Aversion with forced Interpretations of Holy Writ.

The words of *Ostorodius* (y) hint to us at what end they begin. " If Reason (said he) shews expressly that a Trinity of Persons in God is false, how could it ever come into the Mind of an understanding Man to think it to be true, and that

(u) Hist. Ref. Polon. l. i. c. i. p. 7.

(x) Slicht adv. Meiss. de SS. Trin. p. 67. Smalc. Cont. Franz. Disp. 4.

(y) Ostor. c. 4. Instit.

“it can be proved by the Word of God ? And further, They own, with us, from the Principles of Reason, that God is just and good ; but then, with the *Platonists*, they measure Justice and Goodness by particular Notions, which are *their Reasonings*, but not the Reason of Mankind. And when any thing is said in the Scripture which is contrary to such measures, they are ready to depart from it. Upon this account it is, that many of them deny the Doctrine of the Eternal Torments of the finally Impenitent ; not because it is not plain enough in Scripture, but because it seems contrary to their Notions of Justice, Goodness and Mercy ; though to the true Notions of them it may be reconcil’d. Thus *Ernestus Sonnerus* lays it down (z) as his Principle in the first place that the Eternal pains of the Wicked are contrary to Gods Justice ; and being prepossessed with this prejudice, he can, thenceforth, find nothing in the Scripture which may overrule his Opinion.

(z) Ern. Sonn.
Demonstr.
Theol. &
Philos. p. 36.

All this is not my private, and (as some *Socinians* may call it) uncharitable conjecture ; there is a Romanist (a) who has said the same thing, and in very plain terms. “The *Socinian* (saith he) “judgeth the Bible to be the wisest and most Authenticall Book that ever was Written ; such a one, “as no other humane Writing can contest with it ; “yet not such a one as no slip nor error may fall “into it, even in matters of importance, and concerning our Salvation : And therefore, that where “reason is absolutely against it, he may leave it ; “though for Civility sake, he will rather choose to “put a wrong Gloss upon it, than plainly refuse “it. — It cannot be pretended that Scripture is
“ his

(a) Disc. of Infallib. in Religion, p. 200.

"his Rule: for, seeing he supposeth Scripture to be
 "Fallible, and that, upon all occasions, he cor-
 "recteth it by his discourse; it is not Scripture but
 "his discourse, and his reasoning, that is his true
 "and Supreme Rule. Which is the cause that they,
 "or some of their party did denominate themselves
 "Sanarations from right reason.

And as we have a greater Veneration for the
 Scriptures than most *Arians* and *Socinians*; so have
 we a truer regard to real *Tradition*, which they use,
 not so much as a witness of any great value, as a fit
 weapon for the encountring those who dispute out
 of Antiquity; to the end that they may overcome
 them with their own Arms. *Socinus* (b) had con-
 sulted some of the Antient Writers. He was one of
 the first in his Age who suspected some of those
 Epistles to be spurious, which went under the Ve-
 nerable Name of *Ignatius the Martyr*. But I have
 not observed in any of his Writings, that he puts
 a value upon any such Authority, nay, he writes in
 Divinity in such manner as if no Church-Writers
 had so gone before him as to give any considerable
 light to him. He promiseth a Tract for the satis-
 faction of those, (c) who were moved (in his opini-
 on) more than was fit with the Authority of the Fa-
 thers. And though, in this one point of the *Father*
as the one Creator, he cites the Antients by way of
 Argument to the Men who esteem them; yet in
 other Articles he confesses that he stands divided
 from them (d), and rather Glories that he gives
 light to all the World, than borrows from it. The

(b) Resp. ad
 Vujek. p. 618.

(c) Socin. ibid.
 — in illorum
 gratiam qui
 istorum Pa-
 trum Autho-
 ritate plus
 quam debeat
 moveretur.

(d) Soc. ibid.
 p. 618. Col. 1.
 Neque enim

(arbitror) ex Script. nostr. hom. ostendetur unquam, eos asserere aut existimare,
 Scriptores ante Conc. Nic. qui hodie extant, nostræ sententiæ fuisse, &c. nisi nostræ sent.
 nom. intelligatur simpliciter id, quod sentimus de Uno illo Deo, &c.

Author

(e) Brev. Disqu.
c. 5. de Trad.
p. 22.
See c. 2. p. 6, 7.
&c.

(f) Ruar. Epist.
Vol. I. p. 116.
to 139. partic.
p. 132, 134.

Author of the *Brief Disquisition* (e) blames the Protestants for the great deference they pay to unwritten Tradition, meaning by it that which is not Written in the Scriptures, but in the Fathers; although, at the same time, he makes them to ascribe to Councils and single Fathers a greater Authority than they really do, notwithstanding they are very just to them. *Ruarus* (f) though he was a Man of extraordinary Candor, yet, in his Letters to *Bergina*, he does not barely refuse, but reject with derision, his Catholick Interpretation of Scripture according to the Rule of *Vincentius Livinensis* which admitteth, "That Sense which was every where, always and of all beleived. [A Rule by which we help our selves.] And he further professeth that he should be much concern'd, if the Interpretations of *Calvin* and *Luther* were not more solid and acute than those of the Fathers.

We of this Church consider in the Interpretations of the Fathers, not so much the acuteness (though in *S. Chrysostome*, for instance sake, and in *Theodoret*, it is not wanting) as we do the History, and the light which they may give us into the consent of the Churches in the Primitive times.

(g) See Slicht,
contra Cico-
hov. p. 181,
182.

(h) Euseb. H.E.
l. 3. c. 32.
p. 104, 105.
Τὴν αὐτὴν τὰ ὅτι
αὐτὸς πλάττει
τὸν λόγον ὡς
ἐμβαλεῖν ἢ
ἑστῶς.

(i) V. Frag. ap.
Euf. E. H. l. 5.
c. 28. p. 195,
&c.

We are not apt to believe that there was such an Universal Corruption and Apostacy (g) as *Socinians* speak of immediately after the Apostles times. We are not Strangers to the Testimony of *Hegeffippus* (h) of which they make use for the blackning of the Primitive Church. He does not say that the Leprosy was spread throughout the Church, but that it began early. We do not undervalue the *Fathers*, but proceed in the method of the Antients who began first with the Holy Scriptures (i), and then defended

cended to those who wrote next after the Holy Pen-
Men. The *Calvinists* themselves, *Radon* and *Silvius*,
in a Disputation at *Petricow* in *Poland* (k), did not
plead just after the manner of the *Socinians*. They
pleaded the Scriptures together with *Councils* and
Fathers as Subordinate Witnesses. Their *Socinian*
Adversaries, *Gregorius Pauli* and *Gentilis*, mock'd
at their way of arguing. They profess'd they would
admit of nothing but the pure Word of God as shi-
ing sufficiently by its own Light. And they denied
that there was contain'd in formal terms in the Holy
Scriptures, the Doctrine of Three Persons in one
Divine Essence.

Again, the Members of our Church do not imi-
tate the *Socinians* in traducing (l) *Constantine* the
Great and preferring *Constantius* the *Arian* before
him. They celebrate his Memory as a *Defender* of
the Faith, so far are they from reviling him as a *Per-
verter* of it. They do not joyn with *Socinians* in
reproaching the *Fathers* of *Nice* as Mercenary and
Flexible Men, whom *Constantine* had gained to his
party by interest or force (m). They do not, with
Gregorius Pauli (n) call the Explication of the *Ni-
cene* Faith the *Creed of Sathanastus*. They hate
the irreverence as much as they despise the jingle.
They do not beleive that the *Nicene* Creed is forg'd,
as some *Socinians* do (*), though at the same time
they take this upon the modern Authority of *Lau-
rentius Valla*, whom they make to say, that he
read it in very Antient Books of *Isidore*, who in his
time was a Collector of Councils: Such a Collector
of Councils as *Varillas* of History; a Father and a
Collector together. The truth is, it is *Valla's* bu-
siness to elude the sense of *Isidore*, and to ascribe a

(k) A. 1566.
See Maimb.
Hist. Vol. 3.
p. 355, 356,
357.

(l) Maimb. ibid.
Biddle's Pref.
to Cat. p. 23.
After *Constan-
tine* the Great
together with
the Council of
Nice, had once
deviated, &c.
this opened a
Gap, &c.
(m) See Dispi-
in Maimb. H.
Arian. p. 357.
(n) Id. ib.
p. 361.

(*) See Slicht-
cont. Cicov.
p. 184. and
his mistake
followed by
Sandius, H. E.
l. 1. p. 100,
Octavo.

twofold Creed to the *Nicene Fathers*, the *Apostolical*, and that which bears their Name. Whereas *Isidore* distinguishes betwixt their Creed and that of the Apostles (o).

(n) *Isid. Decr.*

Sub hoc (i. e.

Constantino)

juxta fidem

f. c. m. b.) post

etiam sancti Patres in Concilio Niceno de omni orbe terr. convenientes, Evangelicam & Apostolicam secundum (*Valla from MS. A.C. reads it* Apollolos symb. tradiderunt.

The *Protestants* repeat in their Liturgy the Creed of *Nice* in the form agreed on in the *Council of Constantinople*, and would not do so, if they did not believe it *Orthodox*. They do not say with some modern *Arians* (p) that it was framed by *Marcellus Ancyranus* a *Heretick*, or joyn with those *Spanisb Jesuites*, who (it seems) charg'd this Creed with the *Heresie* of *Photinus* the Master of *Marcellus*. They pay a more just Duty to the *Emperour* and the *Nicene Fathers*, than to say with the *Enemies* of the Holy Trinity, that, setting Council against Council (q), they chuse rather to follow those of *Sirmium* and *Rimini* than those of *Nice*. Our Church-Men do not, with the *Socinians*, disregard the Fathers who liv'd after that famous Council, and acknowledge that those Fathers are against it, and bid defiance to their opposition. But so does *Socinus* (r), so does *Crellius* (s), so does *Pisecius* (t), for thus he discourseth. "Do they say Theology knows nothing of this? It is enough if the Apostles do. *S. Austin* "damns this. Christ approves it. The same *Pisecius* is more severe in his censure than *Socinus* himself; and he agrees with *Scaliger* (if *Scaliger* be by him rightly cited) in accusing all the *Fathers* up to *S. Austins* time, of ignorance in another Doctrine about the *Receipt* of departed Souls not *Martyrs*; and

(p) *Chr. Sand.*

Nucl. l. i. p.

100. Octav.

(q) See *Maimb.*

H. A. 357.

(r) *Resp. ad*

Vuiek. p. 618.

Col. 2.

(s) *Crell. Præf.*

ad lib. de Satisf.

fact. p. 5.

(t) *Pisec. An*

Doct. de Trin.

fit Mytt. In

Ep. Ded.

and in affirming that the Errours of the first Fathers prepared the way for Antichrist.

In fine, Though the Church of *England* does not make the *Councils* her Rule of Faith, or make her last Appeal to them; yet she believes that, in times of Controversie, when the Heads of Men are apt to be disturb'd even in Matters otherwise plain enough, by the Heats and Distempers of the Age they live in, they are of special use. The Authority of them tends to the quelling of the Party: And then, when the Faction cools, it tends to the fixing and further strengthening of the weak and interrupted Faith of many. For, as in a Ballance one Scale may descend more or less below the Level; so there may be Faith and Assent without adding the weight of *Fathers* and *Councils*; and yet (in unquiet Times especially and disputing Ages) such Testimonies may give some further strength to Minds made feeble either by publick Distractions, or the private Attacks of Crafty Seducers. Thus our Church gives to the *Scripture* the things that belong to the *Scripture*; and to *Tradition* the Dues of *Tradition*: And it gives more even to the former than generally *Socinians* do; and more also to the latter, though with just Caution and Subordination. So that *their Plea* and *ours* is not, in a strict way of speaking, the very same. But

Fourthly, If we admit that the *Plea* of the *Protestant* and *Socinian* is the same, for the general nature of it; we cannot be truly said to plead for them, unless the general *Plea* be, with Truth and Pertinence, as well as Boldness, applied to the very merit of the Cause. If two Men will plead the same thing with equal Assurance, but not with equal

Reason, in Truth and Merit 'tis not the same. If the Confidence of Men in pleading might weigh against the Right of others, they that were in the wrong would be in the right: For what was wanting in the Reason of the Case, would be supply'd by Impudence. But is it said by any of the *Robe*, that when the Counsel on either side pleads *Presidents*, and *Statutes*, or *Equity*, the *Plaintiff* pleads for the *Defendent*, and the *Defendent* for the *Plaintiff*? Both pretend to the same Rule, but he that is in the right measures his Case by it; the other would bend it towards his illegal Interests. One has a *Plea*, the other a *Pretence*. If a Socinian will plead Scripture, and plead it falsely, it is so far not *ours*, but *his*. If Confidence in pleading may either carry or ballance a Cause, then Pleas of *Laws*, *Scriptures*, *Oral Tradition*, *Fathers*, *Councils*, may be urged contrary ways, and each side be equally justifi'd: For all such Pleas have been made by contrary Parties. Mr. *Lilburn* pleaded Law as much as Judge *Jenkins*, though not as well. Some Dissenters in the *Queens* time wrote down their Arguments, and gave their Book the Title of *Sions Plea*. It may be their Adversaries might call it the *Plea of Babylon*. Whether it was the one or the other, was to be tryed not by the Name of the *Plea*, or the Persuasion of the Advocates, but by the Merit and Nature of the Cause itself. The Apostles pleaded before Magistrates of another Faith, that it was better to obey God than Man. All Parties who dissent from the Establish'd Religion, use the same Plea, and generally in the same Words. But does this make the Pleas equal! Must they not joyn Issue upon the Reason of the Case, and compare their

their Circumstances and those of the Apostles, and observe wherein they agree, and wherein they differ?

If Men, who plead *Scripture* as their Rule of Faith, make Apologie, by so doing, for all others who pretend to the same Rule; then *Catholick Councils* themselves plead for *Socinians*: For (to give an example,) the General Council of *Chalcedon* (and after it *Evagrius*) testifies (u), That the Intent of the *Second Council* was, to make it appear by *Scripture-Testimony*, That such as *Macedonius* err'd in that Opinion which they had advanc'd against the Lordship of the *Holy Ghost*. The Council here us'd the like Plea with *Socinus*, but to a contrary End, and upon surer Reason. In such Cases there will be no satisfactory Conclusion, till the moment of the Scriptures be particularly weigh'd.

For *Tradition*, that was pleaded (x) by *Valentinus*, *Basilides*, *Marcion*, who boasted of their following the Apostle *S. Matthias*. And *Irenæus* (y) observ'd concerning *Hereticks*, that, being vanquish'd by *Scripture*, they accused it, and took Sanctuary in *Tradition*. Thus, after his time, did the *Nestorian Hereticks* (z): Their Epistle to the People of *Constantinople* begins on this manner, *The Law is not deliver'd in Writing, but is placed in the Minds of the Pastors*. And when the *Metropolitans* and *Bishops* of the *Third Council* (that of *Ephesus*,) had confuted *Nestorius* out of the *Scripture*, in stead of answering, he foam'd against them. *S. Cyprian* (a) pleaded *Universal Consent* against Appeals to

(u) Evagr. H.E. l. 2. c. 4. p. 293. — γερμανοὺς ἀπορρυσία. 6.

(x) See Clem. Alex. Str. l. 5.

(y) Iren. l. 3.

(z) See Act. Conc. Eph. Tom. 2. c. 18. Tom. 3. c. 17. Socr. H.E. l. 7. c. 32.

(a) S. Cyprian. Ep. 55. Pam. 59. Oxon. p. 136.

Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, & æquum sit pariter ac iustum, ut uniuersumque causa illic audiat, ubi est Crimen admissum, & sing. Pastor. portio Gregis sit adscripta, quam regat, &c. V. P. Nicæn. Can. 5.

Rome; and that is part of our *Plea* too. Yet the *Romanists* will not allow that he either pleads for our Church, or against their own.

The *Plea* is to be consider'd, and not meerly offer'd. If, for example sake, a Church-man quotes the same *S. Cyprian* in favour of the Doctrine of the Unity in Trinity, and *Sandius* the *Arian* cites the same Father as being against it, are we not to have recourse to the Book itself, and to examine the Pre-
tences on both sides? Or can any Man believe a Quotation is made good by the meer quoting of it? And may not one Party be confuted without the Spirit of Infallibility? It is evident it may be done, for it is done on this manner. *San-*

(b) Chr. Sand.
Append. ad
Interpr. Par-
rad. p. 376,
&c. 379.

dus (b) cites the Book *De Duplici Martyrio*, as not owning the Text in *S. John's Epistle*, *There are three that bear Record in Heaven*. Now that Book is not *S. Cyprians*. It would be a very Extraordinary Birth, if he should be the Father of

(c) De Dupl.
Mart. Ed. Ox.
p. 40.

it; for it makes mention of *Dioclesians* (c) persecution. And yet that spurious Book does not reject the place in *S. John*, though it does not exactly set

(d) De Dupl.
Mart. p. 594.
Ed. Goulart.
Sect. 4. 5.
Commemorat
& Joh. Evang.
Triplex in
terrá Test. Sp.
Agu. & Sang.
&c. quan-

down the Text (d). And for the Genuine *S. Cyprian* (e), he mentions the Text directly, in his Book of the *Unity of the Church*. And of this how are we sure? Why! Let us open the Book and read plain Words, and their unwrested sense gives us satisfaction.

quam hi tres unum sunt, &c.

(e) S. Cypr. de Unit. Ecclesiæ, p. 109. Ox. dicit dominus, Ego & Pater unum sumus, & iterum de Patre & F. & Sp. S. scriptum est, *Et hi Tres Unum sunt*, V. Annot. Oxon.

I conclude, then, that notwithstanding the *Protestants* and *Socinians* do, both of them, plead Scripture as the rule of Faith; yet because *Protestants* plead the rule rightly in the point of the Divinity of the Son of God, and the *Socinians* very falsely (even in the opinion of the *Arians* and *Romanists* themselves) (*f*); the Plea of the former does not *justify* the Plea of the latter; and [*justifie*] is our Authors word. For the Tryal of the Plea we must come to dint of Argument; and Truth is great, and will, in time, prevail.

(f) Editor.
Diff. Anon. de
Pace & Conc.
Eccl. p. 3. ad
Lect. Ingenuè
fateor, Socini
de Chr. perso-
nâ dogma—

Is eo mihi maximè improbari quod Christum ante suam ex Mariâ Virgine Nativitatem
existisse, neget.

CHAP. III.

Particular Answers to the particular Branches of the Protestants Plea for a Socinian, divided into five Conferences by the Author of it.

Señ. 1.

THIS Third Chapter needs not to be drawn into any very great length; for after the general Considerations which answer the general Argument, there wants little more than the Application of them to the respective Heads in the Dialogues.

Arg. 1.
Prot. Plea,
p. 1. to p. 12.

Of the *First Conference* this is the Sum, both *Protestants* and *Socinians* plead *Scripture* as the sole Rule of Faith. Both say, the *Scripture* is sufficiently clear. Both say, it is clear in the Doctrine of the Nature of the Son of God. The *Socinian* professeth himself to be as *Industrious* in finding out the sense of the *Scripture* as the *Protestant*; and he is as well assur'd in his persuasion; therefore the *Protestant*, in this Plea, *Justifies* the *Socinian*, the latter saying the same thing for himself that the former does.

Answer to
Arg. 1.

I answer,
First, (as before,) That though they pretend to the same Rule, they Walk not alike by it. One follows it, the other wrests it. And this ought
not

not to be turn'd to the prejudice of him who is true to his Rule. Let both Opinions be brought to it, and then it will appear which is strait and which is crooked. If Two men lay before them the same Rule of *Addition*, and one works truly by it, and the other, either through want of due attention, or out of unjust design, shall cast up the Sum false, there is no man who will tell us in good earnest, that the first *justifies* the Second; or that both of them needed an *Infallible Arithmetician* to be their Judg.

Secondly, Though this Author picks out this one point of the Divinity of Christ, and represents it in the term of *Cons substantiality*, which to the Vulgar here, is more difficult than that of *Homogeneity* was to the Greeks; and passes by many more easie *Socinian Doctrines*, yet so it is that we find in St. John this very Article plainly revealed. For that Apostle (who certainly was conscious of his own design) wrote the History of his Gospel to this very purpose, *That we might believe that Jesus is the Son of God*: By which each Romanist, who owns (what his Church does,) the Catholick sense of St. John's first Chapter, can understand no other Article than that of *Nice*, that Christ is God of God. S. Joh. 20. 31.

Thirdly, Though the *Socinians* do pretend that the Writings of St. John are to them as clear as to any Protestant, and that they cannot discern in them the Divinity of Christ; yet Confidence in saying a thing is not clear, is not an Argument that it is not. The House is not naturally made dark, becaule the Blind will excuse their Infirmary upon it.

Men

* D. F. Answ.
to the Author
of *Sure-Foot-*
ing, p. 346, 347

Men will say Doctrines are obscure, even when they are secretly convinc'd of their evidence. For Pride and Prejudice are not very yeilding. My Adversary here (says a Learned and Good Man *) "seems to object as elsewhere, that some who seem "to follow the Letter of the Scriptures deny this, "[that is, the Divinity of Jesus Christ] as do the "Socinians. What then? This is not for want of "Evidence in Scripture, but from making or devising ways to avoid this Evidence. Will this "Author say, that there was no Evidence of there "being Angels and Spirits, amongst the Jews, because the Sadduces, who had opportunity of observing all such Evidence, beleived neither Angel nor Spirit? And will he say that there was no clear Evidence from the Word of Christ and his Miracles, *that they were from God*, because the Pharises and other unbelieving Jews, who conversed with him, and saw his Miracles, and heard his Word, did not acknowledge him for God? [I suppose nor].

Fourthly, It does not become the Author (who is a Romanist) to say of the Protestant pleading Scripture, that, in so doing, he justifies the Plea of the Socinian? For that supposes that the one has as much reason on his side as the other. Whereas a Romanist is oblig'd to own that the Protestant, so far as it is oppos'd to the Socinian Creed, is the true Catholick Faith; and that the *Nicene Creed* which is common to us and them, is founded on the Scripture, though the bottom on which it stands is by the Church to be discover'd; whilst his Church condemns the Doctrines of *Socinus* as Hæretical, and

and therefore as such as cannot at all, either plainly or obscurely, be contain'd in the Holy Canon.

Fifthly, This Author seems to magnifie the Industry of the Socinians, saying, *That none have us'd more diligence in the search of the Scriptures, as appears by their Writings.* This is true in part, and but in part; for sometimes they have been in haste enough. *Slichtingius* (a) made quick dispatch, writing many Commentaries in a few Months, and doing this amidst the Heats and Interruptions of War. Prot. Plea, p. 1. & p. 4. &c.

But, I will allow *Socinus* himself to have been very industrious, and *Crellius* also. Some of the rest have been industrious rather as Scriveners than Commentators, transcribing the sense, and, in part, the words of those who went before them. But if Men are engag'd in new Conceits, they are under a necessity of being diligent. A Text cannot be wrung and squeez'd with a dead Hand, and there is more study requir'd for the perverting of Truth, than for the declaring of it. For the true Interpretation of Scripture, much more is requir'd than Industry and Study. The Protestant therefore, in this Author (b), speaks of a *due Industry*, void of Pride, Passion, and other Interest; and such Industry has not been always acknowledg'd either in the *Arians*, or *Socinians*. (a) Lubieniec. Historial. p. 6.

For the *Arians*, the Antients look'd upon them not so much as idle and ignorant, as mad and impious. The Fathers of the *Sixth Synod* (c) were gathered together against *Arius* the *Distracted Pres-* (b) Prot. Plea. p. 8.

stell. p. 1161. — Kατά 'Αρίου τῷ πανηγύρεσσι

(c) Auct. In-
cert. de 6. Syn.
Oec. ap. In-
Προσβύτιον

(1) Tit. c. 8.
l. 1. E. H.
Redæ, ut, &c.
usque, ad
temp. Arianz
Vesaniæ.

(c) Vinc. Lir.
c. 6 p. 13.

(f) V. Lir. p. 15.
Temerata;
Coniuges, &c.

(g) V. Sand.
Append. ad
Nucl. H. E.

p. 22. Quarto.
(h) Theod. H.
E. l. 1. c. 1.

—*ἡ δὲ Σχολή*
ἡ ἐκείνη
ἐκείνη δὲ ἡ
ἐκείνη.

(i) V. Theod.
Har. Fab. l. 2.
c. 9. & Niceph.
Call. H. E.

l. 8. c. 5.

(k) V. Resp.
Socini. p. 535.

(l) V. Conf.
Christ. Vind.
p. 3. in Resp.
ad Ep. Ded.
Cic.

byter. And the *Latins* call'd his Doctrine the *Arian* *Frenzy* (d). *Vincentius Lirinensis* (e) calls that Heresie the *Poyson of the Arians*, as if it was some venomous and enchanted Liquor. And the Leudness of the *Arian* Manners (f) discover'd the Evil of their Temper; and there was Fierceness in it as well as Leudness. A Disposition more fierce than that of their Adversary *Nicholas* (g), who, they say, gave *Arius* a Box on the Ear, in the midst of the Council: *Arius* exercis'd the Office of an Expounder (h) of Scripture in the Church of *Alexandria*: But his Fundamental prejudice is well understood; that is, he falsly imagin'd that *Alexander* was teaching the Doctrine of *Sabellius*, who confounded the Three Persons and made them but One; and he ran headily from thence, and fell into his own extream (i).

It is true, the Temper of the *Socinians* (especially that of their Master *Socinus*, and of *Crellius* and *Ruarus*) seems much more Virtuous than the Disposition of the *Arians*, less sensual, less fierce and bloody: For they were almost always bred in the School of Affliction, whilst the *Arians* were sometimes an Imperial Party. Notwithstanding which, all *Romanists* have not allow'd the *Socinians* to be very well qualifi'd for the reading of the Scriptures. *Vujekus* chargeth them with beginning at the *Alcoran*, before they came at the Holy Bible (k); though I believe that Charge has a grain of the Misrepresenter in it: *Cichovius* the Jesuit has spoken as severely as *Vujekus*, accusing the *Socinians* (l) "of making such a progress in blaspheming the Son "of God, as to seem to have fallen from a desire of "ther of speaking or thinking rightly of Divine "Things.

Let

Let a *Romanist* consider of the Qualifications of a *Protestant* and a *Socinian* by the effect of their Labours in Matters of Christian Faith, and if he be not blinded with very gross Partiality, he will acknowledge a difference. The *Protestant* finds in the Scripture the Divinity of Christ and the Holy Ghost, and the Merit of Christ's Sacrifice; the *Socinian* pretends the contrary. If the *Protestant* and *Socinian* were equally dispos'd, how comes the One to Interpret as a *Catholic*, the Other as a *Heresiack*? And how can a *Romanist* believe, that God gives an equal Blessing to the Industry of the *Protestants* and *Socinians*, whilst the latter do not so much as pray for Grace to the Spirit of God, nor apply themselves to God the Father, through the Meritorious Sacrifice of his blessed Son; nor to Christ himself as God, but as to the highest of Creatures?

Cichovius (m) therefore, has accus'd the *Socinians* (m) V. Resp. ad Ep. Cichov. p. 3. (n) Resp. ad Vojek. p. 554. as making Christ an Idol. *Socinus* thinks (n) those unfit to make such an Objection, who add to the end of the Books they write, *Praise be to God and the Holy Virgin*. And *Moscorovius* (o) mentions a (o) Moscor. Refut. Append. M. Smiglec. p. 21. Polish *Missal*, in which Prayer to the Holy Ghost was expressly forbidden. And before the Conference betwixt a *Carmelite* and *Stoienski* (p) a Minister of (p) De Jesu Chr. Divin. &c. Disputat. Relatio, p. 3. *Lublin*, the One prays for success first to the Virgin, and then to Christ as God; the Other to Christ, though not as the only God. But let those Parties look to this matter whom it so particularly concerns.

The Question I here ask is this, Whether these following Doctrines proceed from an industrious search of the Scriptures, by a Mind humble and free from Prejudice, Passion, and Worldly Interest?

(g) Sticht. in
1 Tim. 6.
p. 238.

(r) Socin. de
Eccl. p. 323,
326. Ep. 3. ad
Radee. p. 384.
Cat. Rac. de
Eccl. p. 306,
307.

(f) Socin. Op.
Vol. 1. Ep. ad
P. Sophiam
Siemichoviam,
p. 431, 432,
433.

(t) Socin.
Vol. 1. Ep.
ad P. Stator.
p. 433.

(u) S. Luk. 22.
20. Τὸ το
πὺτ. ἢ ἔσται
δρα. ὅταν ἐν τῷ
αἵματι μου τὸ
ὑπερ ὑμῶν ἐκ-
χυθῇ.

(x) Socin. de
usu & fine
Cœnæ Domin.
p. 773.

(y) Socin. de
usu Cœn. Op.
Vol. 1. p. 775.
Hales of Sacr.
p. 59. Op. Vol.
2. p. 185, 186.

terest? As, (*ex. gr.*) "That Christ was not at all,
"till he was conceiv'd in the Body of the Virgin:
"That the Question (*g*), Whether Christ was be-
"fore the World, or after it, is of no moment.
"That his Blood is not a proper Sacrifice. That
"the *Holy Spirit* is not any Person at all, either Di-
"vine or Created. That those who are not Or-
"dained by others may step forth and preach the
"Gospel, and administer the Sacraments (*r*). That
"although Officers are generally employ'd in those
"Functions; yet other Christians are not under
"Obligation to forbear the performance of them.
"That *Baptism* is none of Christ's perpetual Pre-
"cepts in his Church. That it may be used in ad-
"mitting those of riper years into a Church, but
"not as a necessary Christian Rite. That to hold
"it to be such is to add to the Scriptures (*f*). That
"it is an indifferent Ceremony, and, if to be us'd, it is
"to be us'd in the admission of those who come from
"some other Religion to Christianity (*t*). That in
"the words of Christ (*u*), [*This Cup is the New*
"*Covenant in my Blood which is shed for you,*] there
"is a *Solacism*, or false Grammar, and that there
"are many such Incongruities in the New Testa-
"ment (*x*). That it is an abuse of the *Lords Sup-*
"*per* to believe that it confers any benefit upon us,
"conveys any Grace from God, or give us any
"further assurance of his favour (*y*). That it is
"Idolatry to kneel at the Sacrament of the Lords
"Supper, and that it may be Celebrated with the
"Head cover'd. If these Doctrines be the results of
"due Industry in searching the Scriptures, Prejudice
"and Negligence may likewise put in their Plea as
"Preparatives to true Interpretation.

But

But farther, in the very manner of *Socinian Exposition*, there is apparent failure. For, though the Holy Writers express the same thing very differently, and without respect to nicety of Words, (as is evident from the several forms of Words us'd in representing Christs Institution of the Lords Supper); yet the *Socinians* make Interpretations of places which relate to the great Articles of Christian Faith, to turn upon subtleties of Grammatical construction. For Example sake, they perplex the most comfortable Doctrine of Christs satisfaction with curious observations about the Particle *For* (z). Whereas our Churchmen make the *Old Testament*, the *Key of the New*; and finding plainly that the Sacrifices of Attonement under the Law, were the Types of the Offering the Blood of Jesus upon the Cross; they conclude that God, with respect to Christs Death in the quality of the great Expiation, did admit the guilty World into a reconcileable Estate.

I might add that, by coming to particulars, the *Socinian Prejudice* and insincere Artifice, in expounding such places of Holy Writ as concern their Scheme, will appear to all unbyassed Readers. I will instance in the Interpretation of that place in *S. John* (a), *No Man hath Ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man which is in Heaven*. *Socinus*, for the avoiding a twofold nature in Christ, by which he might be both in Heaven and in Earth, and exist before he was born of a Virgin, sets down a twofold *Evasion* in the place of an *Explication*. "First, he inter-
 "prets *Ascending into Heaven*, by seeking after
 "Heavenly things, and *Descending from Heaven*,
 "by

(z) See Crell.
 de Sat. p. 6.
 190, &c. about
 vñg & w, &c.

(a) S. Joh. 3. 13.
 Soc. Exp. Loc.
 Script. Vol. 1.
 p. 146.

“by having Learned such Celestial things. And,
 “to make all sure, he takes the hardiness to say, in
 “the *Second Place*, that as *S. Paul* was snatched up
 “into the third Heavens, and let down again; so
 “the Man Christ Jesus, was taken up into Heaven,
 “somewhile before his Death, and made some stay
 “there. And by his coming down again he ex-
 “plaineth his going forth *from the Father*, his *As-*
 “*cending into Heaven*, his *being in Heaven*:

If this be Interpreting, what is Perverting?

Prot. Plea, Di-
 gression, p. 9,
 10.

Sixthly, Whereas (in the end of this first Confe-
 rence) the Author himself speaks as a third Person
 and a Romanist, and raises a doubt about the cer-
 tainty any Man can arrive at in having *rightly used*
his Industry; I would only ask him, Whether a Man
 cannot be as sure of his *industry* in consulting his
 Reason and the Scriptures, as in attending on Coun-
 cils, Fathers, Decrees of Popes, and the Method of
 the Major part of Church Governors, in the Uni-
 versal Church of all Ages?

Sett. 2.
 Arg. 2.

For the Argument of the Second Confe-
 rence, this is the Substance of it.

Prot. Plea, p.
 12. to 16.

THE *Scinians* Plead, that they ought not to
 receive the Article of the Divinity of Christ,
 from the Major part of Church Governors: That
 it was not originally in the Creed: That no Article
 ought to be receiv'd from Church Authority, till
 Men are convinc'd that it is grounded on the Scrip-
 ture, which Conviction they want. Now, unless
 the Church were Infallible in all she determin'd, or
 at least in distinguishing those necessities in which
 she

she cannot err, from Points which are not of such necessity; she cannot justify her self in putting her Definitions into a Creed. *Protestants*, notwithstanding they own the Article of Christs Divinity, and urge the whole Creed into which it is put, do yet argue after the manner of the *Socinians* against Church-Authority, and plead the Scripture as their Ground; and a necessity of Conviction; therefore (whilst they continue this kind of Plea) they cannot by Church-Authority either justify themselves, or confute their Adversaries.

All this reasoning may be confuted by these distinct Answers. Answer to Arg. 2.

1. We have no need of confuting *Arians* and *Socinians*, by Church-Authority; seeing we can do it more effectually out of the Scriptures; and if they say, that the Scriptures are on their side, their saying so does not alter the Nature of Truth. And the *Romanists* allow that they say not true, and they may be confuted when they are not silenc'd. *Protestants* decline not a disputation with *Socinians*, by the Rule of Primitive Church-Authority. But if they undervalue this rule, it is discretion in *Protestants* to debate the matter with them in a way which they themselves best like of, seeing that is also a more certain, as well as a more speedy way, to Victory.

2. *Protestants* do not well understand what *Romanists* mean by Church-Authority, for some of their *Dofors* (b), can by a new figure of their own, make a part and the whole of the Church to be the same. They do not think that the present

(b) J. Richard
Aphorismes de
Controverse.
Instr. 34. p.
223. Le Con-
cile de Trente,
c'est à dire,
toute l'Eglise.

Major

Major part of Church-Governors throughout the Church can be their Rule, because the People cannot always know which is that Part; or that it ought to be their Rule, because, in some Ages the Minor part is the wiser and better. Let not the Roman Church be griev'd at this, as said from me; *Vincen-tius Lirinensis* said it long ago, that in the *Arian* times (c) there was a general darkness even over the face of the *Latin* Church. In the mean time they are made to suppose by this Author what they do not suppose, that the judgment of the *Catholic* Church is not Infallible, in judging what points are necessary, what are not. For though this or that Church or party of Christians may fail, yet all cannot at once; for then the Church would fail.

(c) Vinc. Lirin. adv. Hæreses. cap. 6. p. 13. —propè cunctis Latini Sermōnis Episcopis, partim vi, partim fraude deceptis, caligo, &c. Prot. Plea, p. 15. Sect. 17.

3. This Article of the Divinity of the Son of God was originally in the Creed; for that the Fathers meant when in the Apostolical Creed they confessed Christ to be *Gods only Son*. And this they grounded on the Gospel of *S. John*, who wrote his Gospel (which begins with Christs Divinity,) with this intention, that Men should beleive Jesus to be the Son of God.

4. *Protestants* admit of no Article of Faith which is not grounded on the Scripture, which was never known before, and never oblig'd before; yet, in the mean time they see no reason, why an Article assaulted by Hereticks and Sophists may not be explained; or why the form of *Confession* design'd for *Baptism*, might not be enlarged for the benefit of the Church, and made a Sum of the Necessaries to be believ'd. It sufficed at the first Incorporation of Persons to be *Baptiz'd*, that they profess'd to believe the Religion which owneth Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

5. A particular Church may put an Article of Faith into a *Creed*, without pretending to Infallibility. She has Ability to do it, because she has an Infallible Rule by which she can go. But she ought not to say it is impossible *any* Church should do otherwise; because a Party of Men may do that which they ought not to do, and to which they were not constrain'd. Prejudice, Mis-attention, Corruption may so prevail as to clap a false Byass upon Makers of Creeds: Else how came we by those of *Sirmium* and *Rimini*? And for instance sake, in the *Infallible Science* of the *Mathematicks*, the perverseness of the Temper of the *Leviathan*, would not permit him to agree with a Learned Professor of that Science, even in the first Elements of Geometry; and a Controversie was maintain'd not only about the *squaring of the Circle*, but about the Dimensions of a *Point* and a *Line*.

The Force of the *Third Conference* may be set down on this manner.

Sect. 3.

Arg. 3.

A Protestant submits to the Decrees of a *Council*, no further than he is convinc'd that the same *Council* is rightly constituted, and that her Definitions are founded on the Word of God. He believes that it may err in things not Necessary, and in Necessaries too if it be not a truly *General Council*. He can scarce give to it the Obedience of silence in that which he believes contrary to the Scripture. The *Socinian* says the same things, and denies the *Council* of *Nice* to be constituted rightly; Therefore the *Protestant* justifies the *Socinian*.

Prot. Plea,
from p. 16.
to p. 24.

Answer to.
Arg. 3.

Our Author should have gone on, and said, (for so a Romanist is by the Tenor of his Faith oblig'd to say) That the Protestant, with reference to the *Council of Nice*, has the Reason on his side.

Vinc. Lir. adv.
hær. c. 6. De
Arianorum
veneno, p. 15.
benè fundata
Antiquitas.

A Son of the Church of *England* reverenceth the Four General Councils, of which *Nice is the First*. He believes its Faith to be bottom'd on the Scriptures, and so did the Council itself, and so does the Church of *Rome*. He receives it as a General Council rightly Constituted, though no Pope call'd it, or otherwise confirm'd it than the rest of the Patriarchs, Metropolitans and Bishops. He believes its Doctrine to be, in the Phrase of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, well-founded Antiquity, and he offers to prove it. A *Socinian* therefore, if he has retain'd him, will, as soon as he hears such a Plea as this, desire him to return his Fee.

V. l. 3. Conc.
Nic. Ed. Pif.

But what if a *Socinian* be found perverse, and, being a Disputer of this World, will have his own way of arguing? May not the Protestant wave the *Council of Nice*, and enter the Lists, with Reason and Scripture? He that will not have him do it, is not of the same mind either with the Fathers of *Nice*, or with the Celebrated Latin Doctor *S. Austin*. The *Council of Nice* disputed with the *Arians* out of the Scripture, and confuted them by it. The Bishops of it, by *Eusebius*, cite against them the words of *St. John*, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*. They argue from the words themselves, as words clear and plain in their signification: They take notice of the [*Word was*,] as contrary to [*was not*,] and [*was God*,] as contrary to [*was not God*,]. *S. Austin* observing the perverseness of

Maximine,

Maximine, lays aside *Councils*, not as useless, but as of lesser Authority than the Holy Scripture, the force of which his Adversary could not, with the same ease and readiness, have avoided. "Neither ought I (saith *S. Austin*) to alledge the Council of *Nice*, nor you that of *Ariminum*; for neither am I bound to the Authority of the one; nor you to that of the other. Let us both dispute with the Authorities of Scripture, which are Witnesses common to us both. Our Author puts this Citation into the *Socinians* Mouth, and takes it from *Dr. Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery*; but, seeing it is the Method of *S. Austin*, why does he not justify a Protestant in using of it?

Prot. Plea.
p. 18.

The Sum of the Fourth Conference is Sect. 4.
this. Arg. 4.

A Protestant excuseth himself from *Heresie* by saying, A *Heretick* is (what he himself is not) an Obstinate Maintainer of a Fundamental Error. None can be such *Hereticks* to whom the Truth is not sufficiently proposed. *Councils* may not always rightly distinguish betwixt Fundamentals and non Fundamentals. He is not oblig'd to receive their Definitions till he is convinc'd of the truth of them. He himself is Judge whether the Article be sufficiently propos'd, and whether he is convinc'd by that which is offer'd to him. The *Socinian* says the same thing for himself. Our Author should have added, that he says it with equal Reason, if he would have made the one plead for the other. But the *Protestant*, in this point of the

Prot. Plea,
p. 24. to 32.

Answer to
4 Arg.

Divinity of the Son of God, (which is the Authors Instance) does acknowledge that the Doctrine is sufficiently propos'd; does receive the *Council of Nice*; does own that he is convinc'd. And the *Romanist* confesseth that, thus far, he is in the right, and the *Socinian* in the wrong. This comes to the same thing which was said before, and the Answer is repeated, because the Objection is brought again. And indeed there is but *one Argument*, strictly so call'd, in all the *Five Conferences* which turn upon the same Hinge; and one Answer suffices: *viz.* That when Two say the same things concerning contrary Doctrines, one of them only can have Truth on his side: And that if both be equally confident, the Confidence of the Persons does not make the Contradiction true. The *Plea* is his, not who barely offers it, but who can make it good. In this Point of the Divinity, the *Protestant* makes his *Plea* good by the Scripture and the *Council of Nice*, as a true General Council: And if his *Plea* be true, surely it does not cease to be so, because he has not had it allow'd before a Roman Judge: A Man is sure that all the Articles in the *New Covenant* are genuine, though they be not confirm'd under the Lead of the *Fisher*.

I come to the last *Conference*, where our Author reasons to this effect. Arg. 5.
Sect. 5.

THE *Protestants* imagine they excuse themselves from *Schism*, by alledging, that they left a Corrupt part of the Church, (meaning the Roman) and Reform'd themselves. That the Schifin is theirs who caus'd it, that they are united to all Churches in Charity, and in the unity of the Catholick Church, being with them in all things in which they are obliged to be with them. And in the rest they are hindred from external Communion by the sinful Conditions which a particular Chureh puts upon them. The *Socinians* say the same thing for themselves, with reference to other Communions besides the *Roman*, therefore the *Protestant justifies* the *Plea* of the *Socinian* in Relation to *Schism*. Prot. Plea, p. 32. to p. 45.

The same Answer serves for the same Objection. Answer to 5 Arg.
Socinians say as *Protestants* do, but the reason is on the side of the latter, and not on the former. And our Author himself, with respect to his *Instance* of the *Divinity* of the Son of God, will, by no means, say, that the *Socinians*, who make that Article, where impos'd, a sinful condition of Communion, can by saying so, excuse themselves from *Schism*, whilst they any where refuse external Communion upon the pretence of that Article as not Christian. A *Romanist* cannot say that it is not sufficiently propos'd to the *Socinians*, and that it was never in their power to be convinc'd. If they will turn this upon us with reference to our not separating from them but

but standing where we were, after having in Christian, and Legal manner also, thrown off the Corruptions which were unagreeable to the Primitive Christianity, we will try it over again with them by Scripture, Antiquity and Reason; and the Impartial World shall judge, if it pleases, Whether the Additional Articles in the Creed of *Pope Pius* are of God or Men.

For this point of *Schism*, as here manag'd, the reasoning of this *Fifth Conference* was long ago confuted by *Mr. Chillingworth*. But our Author did not condescend to take notice of it, though he cites many other Words of *Mr. Chillingworth* not far from these. But a Cunning Marks-Man will not put that into his Gun which may make it Recoil. However I shall be bold to produce the Words, which he, in all probability, did studiously omit*.

* See here p.
9, 22, 58.
Chill. part. I.
Chap. 5. p. 255.
Sect. 8c.

“Whereas *D. Potter* says, there is a great difference between a Schism from them, and a Reformation of ourselves: This (you say) is a quaint Subtilty, by which all Schism and Sin may be as well excused. It seems, then, in your Judgment, that Thieves and Adulterers, and Murthers, and Traytors, may say with as much probability as Protestants, that they do no hurt to others, but only Reform themselves. But then methinks it is very strange, that all Protestants should agree with one consent in this defence of themselves from the imputation of Schism: And that, to this day, never any Thief or Murtherer should have been heard of to make use of this Apology! And then for *Schismatiques*, I would know, whether *Victor Bishop of Rome*, who Excommunicated the Churches of *Asia*, for not conforming to his Church

“ Church in keeping *Easter* ; whether *Novatian*
“ that divided from *Cornelius*, upon pretence that
“ himself was elected Bishop of *Rome*, when indeed
“ he was not ; whether *Felicissimus* and his Crew,
“ that went out of the Church of *Carthage*, and set
“ up Altar against Altar, because, having fallen in
“ persecution, they might not be restored to the
“ Peace of the Church presently, upon the Inter-
“ cession of the *Confessors* ; whether the *Donatists*
“ who divided from, and damned all the World,
“ because all the World would not Excommunicate
“ them who were accused only, and not convicted,
“ to have been *Traditors* of the Sacred Books ; whe-
“ ther they which for the slips and infirmities of
“ others, which they might and ought to Tolerate,
“ or upon some difference in matters of Order and
“ Ceremony, or for some Error in Doctrine, nei-
“ ther pernicious nor hurtful to Faith or Piety, se-
“ parate themselves from others, or others from
“ themselves ; or lastly, whether they that put
“ themselves out of the Churches Unity and Obe-
“ dience, because their Opinions are not approved
“ there, but reprehended and confuted ; or because,
“ being of impious Conversation, they are impati-
“ ent of their Churches Censure ; I would know
“ (I say) whether all or any of these, may with
“ any Face or without extream Impudency, put in
“ this Plea of Protestants, and pretend with as
“ much likelihood as they, that they did not sepa-
“ rate from others but only reform themselves ?
“ But, suppose they were so impudent as to say so in
“ their own Defence falsely, doth it follow by any
“ good Logick, that therefore this *Apology* is not to
“ employ’d by Protestants who may say so truly ?

We

*"We make (say they) no Schism from you, but only
"a Reformation of ourselves: This (you reply) is
"no good justification, because it may be pretended by
"any Schismaticque. Very true, any Schismaticque
"that can speak may say the same Words, (as any
"Rebel that makes Conscience the Cloak of his
"impious Disobedience, may say with S. Peter, and
"S. John, We must obey God rather than Men :) But
"then the Question is, whether any Schismaticque
"may say so truly? And to this Question you say
"just nothing: But conclude, because this defence
"may be abused by some, it must be used by none.
"As if you should have said, S. Peter, and S. John
"did ill to make such an Answer as they made, be-
"cause impious Hypocrites might make use of the
"same to palliate their Disobedience and Rebellion,
"against the Lawful Commands of Lawful Autho-
"rity.*

The Conclusion.

After all this causeless finding fault with the *Plea* of the *Protestant*, what is it that the *Romanists* aim at, and after what manner would they mend this *Plea*? They will tell you, "This seems to be the Consequence of the late way taken up by many *Protestants*, viz. That in stead of the *Roman Church* her setting up some Men (the Church-Governors) as *Infallible* in *Necessaries*; here is set up by them every *Christian*, if he will, both *Infallible* in all *Necessaries*; and certain that he is so. They will endeavour to persuade you, that the Great Ends they aim at are, *Truth* and *Peace*: And that these Blessed Ends are never to be universally attain'd without an *Infallible Church* to which all may submit their Judgments in Religion, and, by such submission, preserve *Unity*. They will continue their discourse, and say, Without such a Judge, every Mans Reason is Reason, and every Mans Scripture is Scripture, and he is left to run wild after his own Imaginations. And though a Man is not in the right, he will not yield he is so, till it is given against him by an *Infallible Judge*.

But Men must first be satisfi'd that there is such a Judge, and who he is, and where and how to be

found, and how far Men will follow him. When there was such a Judge on Earth, (the most *Infal-
lible High-Priest*, the Blessed *JESUS*) prejudic'd and perverse Men would neither be of *One Faith*, nor of *One Heart*. The Wisdom of God will not, by forcing of Assent, destroy the Nature and Virtue of it; and he hath declar'd that he will permit *Hereses*, that those who are approved and excellent Christians may be distinguished from those who are not. This Expedient of the *Romanists* is like that of the Atheist *Spinoza*, who has left the following Maxim to the World as his Legacy for Peace, *viz.* That the Object of Faith is not Truth but Obedience, and the quiet of human Society. And they say in effect, Shut all your Eyes, and agree in one who shall lead you all, and you will all go one way: But the difficulty lies in getting them to agree. It is not difficult to say a great deal more upon this Subject; but, in stead of that which might be here offer'd from myself, I will refer the Reader to a Book lately publish'd, and call'd, *A Discourse concerning a Judge in Controversies*; if he be not satisfi'd with that which Mr. *Chillingworth* hath said long ago, and to which this Author has here said nothing (a).

(a) *Chill. Pref.*
to *Char.*
maintain'd.
p. 8, 9. Sect. 12,
13, 14, 15.
(b) See here
p. 9. 13, 22, 34.

"You say (b) again confidently, That, if this
"Infallibility be once impeach'd, every Man is gi-
"ven over to his own Wit and Discourse. By which
"if you mean *Discourse*, not guiding itself by Scri-
"pture, but only by Principles of Nature, or per-
"haps by Prejudices and popular Errors, and draw-
"ing Consequences not by Rule but by Chance, is,
"by no means, true. If you mean by *Discourse*,
"Right Reason, grounded on Divine Revelation
"and

"and common Notions, written by God in the
 "Hearts of all Men; and deducing, according to
 "the never-failing Rules of Logick, consequent
 "Deductions from them: If this be it which you
 "mean by *Discourse*, it is very meet, and reason-
 "able and necessary, that Men, as in all their Acti-
 "ons, so especially in that of greatest importance,
 "the choice of their way to Happiness, should be
 "left unto it: And he that follows this in all Opini-
 "ons and Actions, and does not only seem to do
 "so, follows always God; whereas he that follow-
 "eth a Company of Men, may oft-times follow a
 "Company of Beasts. And in saying this, I say no
 "more than *S. John* to all Christians in these words,
 "*Dearly Beloved, believe not every Spirit; but try*
 "*the Spirits, whether they be of God or no:* And the
 "Rule he gives them to make this tryal by, is to
 "consider, whether they *Confess JESUS to be Christ*;
 "that is, the Guide of their Faith, and Lord of their
 "Action; not, Whether they acknowledge the Pope
 "to be his Vicar. I say no more than *S. Paul*, in
 "exhorting all Christians, *To try all things, and hold*
 "*fast that which is good:* Than *S. Peter* in command-
 "ing all Christians, *To be ready to give a reason of*
 "*the hope that is in them:* Then our Saviour him-
 "self, in forewarning all his Followers, *that if they*
 "*blindly followed blind-Guides, both Leaders and Fol-*
 "*lowers should fall into the Ditch.* And again, in
 "saying even to the People, *Yea, and why of your*
 "*selves judge ye not what is right?* And though
 "by Passion, or Precipitation, or Prejudice, by
 "want of Reason, or not using what they have,
 "Men may be, and are oftentimes, lead into Er-
 "ror and Mischief; yet, that they cannot be
 "mis-

"misguided by *Discourse*, truly so called, such as I
 "have described, you yourself have given them se-
 "curity. For, what is *Discourse*, but drawing Con-
 "clusions out of Premises by good Consequence?
 "Now, the Principles which we have settled, to wit,
 "the *Scriptures*, are on all sides agreed to be Infalli-
 "bly true. And you have told us in the Fourth
 "Chapter of this Pamphlet, *That from Truth no*
 "*Men can, by good Consequence, infer Falshood;*
 "*Therefore, by Discourse, no Man can possibly be*
 "led to error; but if he erre in his Conclusions, he
 "must of Necessity, either err in his Principles,
 "(which here cannot have place) or commit some
 "error in his *Discourse*; that is, indeed, not *Dis-*
 "course, but seem to do so.

"13. You say, Thirdly, with sufficient confi-
 "dence, *That if the true Church may err in defining*
 "*what Scriptures be Canonical, or in delivering the*
 "*sense thereof, then we must follow either the private*
 "*Spirit, or else natural Wit and Judgment; and by*
 "*them examine what Scriptures contain true or false*
 "*Doctrine, and in that respect ought to be received or*
 "*rejected.* All which is apparently untrue, neither
 "can any proof of it be pretended. For though
 "the present Church may possibly err in her Judg-
 "ment touching this matter, yet have we other
 "directions in it, besides the private Spirit, and
 "the Examination of the Contents (which latter
 "way may conclude the Negative very strongly, to
 "wit, that such or such a Book cannot come from
 "God, because it contains irreconcilable Contra-
 "dictions; but the Affirmative it cannot conclude;
 "because the Contents of a Book may be all true;
 "and yet the Book not Written by Divine inspira-
 "tion;)

"tion;) other direction therefore I say we have be-
sides either of these three, and that is, the Testi-
mony of the Primitive Christians.

14. "You say, Fourthly, with convenient bold-
ness, that *this Infallible Authority of the Church*
"being denied, no Man can be assured, that any par-
"cel of the Scripture was Written by Divine Inspira-
"tion: Which is an untruth, for which no proof is
"pretended; and besides, void of Modesty, and
"full of Iniquity. The First, because the Experi-
"ence of Innumerable Christians is against it; who
"are sufficiently assured, that the Scripture is Di-
"vinely inspired, and yet deny the Infallible Au-
"thority of your Church, or any other. The Se-
"cond, because if I have not ground to be assured
"of the Divine Authority of Scripture, unless I first
"believe your Church *Infallible*, then can I have
"no ground at all to believe it. Because there is
"no ground, nor can any be pretended, why I
"should believe the Church *Infallible*, unless I first
"believe the Scripture Divine.

15. "Fifthly and lastly, You say, with confi-
dence in abundance; that *none can deny the Infal-*
"lible Authority of your Church, but he must abandon
"all infused Faith, and True Religion, if he do but
"understand himself: Which is to say, agreeable to
"what you had said before, and what out of the
"abundance of the Heart you speak very often, that
"all Christians besides you are open Fools, or concealed
"Atheists. All this you say with notable Confi-
dence, (as the manner of Sophisters is, to place
"their Confidence of Prevailing in their Confident
"manner of Speaking,) but then for the Evidence
"you promis'd to maintain this Confidence, that is
"quite vanished and become invisible. HE

* Prot. Plea,
B.P. 45.

Hitherto I have been arguing against our Author; but now, in the close, I cannot but joyn with him in his *Protestants Exhortation to Humility* *. It is an Admirable Virtue; and may God grant to me, and to all Men, a greater Measure of it. It is a Virtue proper even for Guides in Religion, that they may humbly help the *Faith* of others, and not exercise Dominion over it.

* A Defence of
the Papers,
&c. p. 126.

And, because a late Writer has been pleas'd to suffer this severe censure to drop from his Pen*, ["it is the less to be admir'd that [our Author] is such a stranger to that Spirit [of Meekness and humble Charity,] because among all the Volumes of Divinity, written by the Protestants, there is not one Original Treatise, at least, that I have seen or heard of, which has handled distinctly and by itself, that Christian Virtue of Humility."] I will tell him of one Book (as I could of many others) written singly upon that Subject. I mean a late Treatise by *Mr. Allen**, a Man who had considered many ways, but long before his Death, approv'd of that of the Church of *England*, as the most safe and Apostolical. He was a Lay-Man, a Citizen, a Man of little skill in Languages or Scholastick-Learning, yet, by Gods Blessing upon his Industry and Sincerity, and the Ministerial helps he met with in our Communion, I will be bold to say he understood the Scriptures as judiciously as many Learned *Romish Commentators*, who have got a Name in the World, and stand pompously, in several Volumes, upon the Shelves of Students.

* A Practical
Discourse of
Humility, by
W. A. Lond.
1681.

The End.

E R R A T A.

Pag. 3. lin. 7. for *mixt*, read *mix*. Pag. 13. lin. 6. for *Fairly*, read *Fifthly*. Pag. 34. lin. 22. for *Queens time*, read *unquiet times*.

A Table of Contents.

The Introduction, shewing, That this Tract, and most of those which have been lately written in the Controversies betwixt Romanists and Church-of-England-Protestants, have been occasion'd by the former. P. 3. to p. 7.

Chap. 1. Observations touching the Book itself call'd the **Protestants Plea**, &c. Its Edition, Character and Design. P. 7. to p. 17.

Chap. 2. Considerations touching the General Argument of the **Protestants Plea**, &c. shewing the weakness of it, and that it is not of force enough to overthrow the **Plea** of the **Reformed**. P. 17. to p. 38.

Chap. 3. Particular Answers to the Particular Branches of the **Protestants Plea**, &c. divided into Five Conferences by the Author of it. P. 38. to p. 57.

Sect. 1. The Argument of the First Conference, with the Answer. P. 38. to p. 46.

Sect. 2. The Argument of the Second Conference, with the Answer. P. 46. to p. 49.

Sect. 3. The Argument of the Third Conference, with the Answer. P. 49. to p. 51.

Sect. 4. The Argument of the Fourth Conference, with the Answer. P. 51. to p. 53.

Sect. 5. The Argument of the Fifth Conference, with the Answer. P. 53. to p. 56.

The Conclusion, shewing that the Roman See does not mend that of the Reformed of this Church, but come short of it; and that every Protestant is not wholly left to the private guidance of his own Imagination.

Chapter I. The Argument of the First Conference, with the Answer. P. 1. to P. 46.

Chapter II. The Argument of the Second Conference, with the Answer. P. 46. to P. 91.

Chapter III. The Argument of the Third Conference, with the Answer. P. 91. to P. 136.

Chapter IV. The Argument of the Fourth Conference, with the Answer. P. 136. to P. 181.

Chapter V. The Argument of the Fifth Conference, with the Answer. P. 181. to P. 226.

Chapter VI. The Argument of the Sixth Conference, with the Answer. P. 226. to P. 271.

Chapter VII. The Argument of the Seventh Conference, with the Answer. P. 271. to P. 316.

Chapter VIII. The Argument of the Eighth Conference, with the Answer. P. 316. to P. 361.

Chapter IX. The Argument of the Ninth Conference, with the Answer. P. 361. to P. 406.

